Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are

respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-9 will be pending.

In the office action, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1-9 as

being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,340,897 to Miller. The Examiner suggests that

Miller's brush structure "blocks" the nozzle surface, according to a broad

interpretation of claim 1. Applications have amended claim 1 to further distinguish

Miller. More specifically, claim 1 now recites: "blocking the nozzle surface from

outside such that ink cleaned from a non-nozzle surface does not recontaminate the

nozzle surface, and cleaning the non-nozzle surface of the print head without

recontaminating the nozzle surface with ink." This is not new matter, and is

described, for example, at paragraph [0043].

Since the porous brush structure of Miller would not prevent ink cleaned from

the non-nozzle surface from recontaminating the nozzle surface (nor would it be

intended to, in view of the vacuum structure of Miller), claim 1 as amended does not

read on Miller. Accordingly, claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 3, 5, 7 and 9 have

been amended to be consistent with amended claim 1. Claims 2-9 depend from claim

1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above. Accordingly,

claims 2-9 should be allowed as well.

-8-

Appl. No. 10/802,759 Response Dated June 14, 2007 Reply to Office Action of March 14, 2007

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christian C. Michel Attorney for Applicant Reg. No. 46,300

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P. 1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 659-9076

Dated: Tene 14, 2007